

*REMARKS*

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his review of the art and application, and for his consideration of these remarks. Claims 1-22 are presently pending.

Claim Rejections

In the present action, pending claims 1-22 stand rejected. Claims 12-14, 16, 18, 19, and 21 stand rejected under §102 as anticipated by Hanlan (U.S. Pat. No. 4,361,260, hereinafter “Hanlan”). Claims 15, 17, 20, and 22 stand rejected under §103 as obvious in view of Hanlan as combined with Jackson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,568,767, hereinafter “Jackson”). As previously noted, independent claims 12 and 18 each require a plurality of pulling units with adjustable leads. Hanlan does not teach or show a plurality of pulling units, and hence cannot anticipate these independent claims.

The present Action cites rollers 25, 26, 27, and 28 as the recited pulling units. *See* action at p. 2. However, these four rollers do not represent a plurality of pulling units. Rather, they represent one pulling unit (rollers 25 and 26 acting together) and a cutting unit (knife 27 acting against roller 28).

Moreover, the claims expressly recites that the pulling units *guide* the web *to* the cross-cutting device. *See* claim 12 (“guiding a web ... to a cross-cutting device via at least two pulling units”) and claim 18 (“...web guided ... to a cross cutting device via a plurality of pulling units”). Thus, it is clear that the pulling units in the claimed invention must be disposed after the printing unit and before the cross-cutting device. The pulling units of claim 12 cannot be the cross-cutting device itself (as is Hanlon’s combination of 27/28). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Hanlon fails to anticipate either independent claim of the present application.

The remaining pending claims, being dependent from one of the above, also incorporate the limitation of a plurality of pulling units. Although a number of the dependent claims were rejected on the basis of Hanlon combined with Jackson, Jackson does not, as noted previously, teach the use of a plurality of pulling units. It is thus respectfully submitted that the pending dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to the independent claims.

In view of the above explanation, Applicant respectfully submits that Hanlon omits a critical limitation of each claim, and as such, the pending claims are patentable. Applicant

thus believes that the application is in proper condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Phillip M. Pippenger, Reg. No. 46,055  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: July 23, 2007